A U M

It is the characteristic of a wise man that he looks for all his good and evil from himself. As far as his rational nature is concerned, he is in no degree inferior to the gods.—EPICTETUS.

# THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXIX March, 1941 No. 5

## FIGURES OF THE TRANSITION AGE

ALTHOUGH *The Secret Doctrine* repeatedly suggests that the present is a cycle of *change,* the full significance of this view would probably have been lost to students without the comprehensive epitome provided by *The Ocean of Theosophy.* We live, its author wrote, in "an age of transition, when every system of thought, science, religion, government, and society is changing . . . the old days of dogmatism are gone and the 'age of inquiry' has come." The very simplicity of Mr. Judge's statement makes it capable of expansion and application in every direction. In his article, "The Synthesis of Occult Science," the same lucid treatment brings to the student a vision of the part played by the Theosophical Movement in assisting this process of alteration and growth.

The occult explanation of the unique help found by western students in W. Q. J. is given by H. P. Blavatsky. He is, she said, "the Antaskarana (the bridge) between the two Manas (es)—the American thought, and the Indian—or rather, the trans-Himalayan Esoteric knowledge." Thus, for the New World, William Q. Judge was quite literally an *initiating* as well as an initial figure of the transition age. His magazine, the *Path,* H. P. B. called "pure Buddhi," in prophetic hint, perhaps, of his occult relation to the sixth sub-cycle of Fifth Race evolution. There are two kinds of creation spoken of in *The Secret Doctrine,* one ideative and spiritual, the other, an act of physical generation. While humanity as a whole has lost the former power, it should not be supposed that *Kriya Sakti* plays no part in the spiritual genesis of future cycles. The lighting up of Manas has never ceased since the primeval illumination of the Third Race.

There is good reason, then, to follow up the suggestion of the *Ocean* that, "believing in his teacher, the theosophist sees all around him the evidence that the race mind is changing by enlargement," and attempt to apply it specifically to the contemporary scene.

The larger cycle of western development began during the fourteenth century, in response to the occult impulse originating in the

East. In the fifteenth century, America was discovered. Then came the Reformation and the revival of Greek philosophy. The seventeenth century saw the birth of modern science and the beginnings of intellectual liberation, followed, in the eighteenth, by the political struggles of the era of revolution. Then, in the sixth of these hundred-year cycles, the Message brought by H. P. B. summed the preceding series and heralded the age to come. As Mr. Judge wrote:

> With the single exception of the writings of Plato, no one in modern times has given the world any approximation to a complete philosophy, previous to the appearance of H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine*. . . . We are now in a transition period, and in the approaching twentieth century there will be a revival of genuine philosophy, and the Secret Doctrine will be the basis of the "New Philosophy." . . . The time must come when the really advanced thinkers of the age will be compelled to lay by their indifference, and their scorn and conceit, and follow the lines of philosophical investigation laid down in the *Secret Doctrine*.

The constructive movements in Europe and America before the coming of H. P. B. were cumulative; they were all concerned with elaboration of the social and intellectual forms which, in the last century, would combine to make the exoteric vehicle for the Secret Doctrine. H. P. B. used all those elements of truth which had been assimilated by western thought from former efforts of the adepts, giving a new embodiment to the age-old Wisdom Religion. So complete is her recording that, as she said, "it will take centuries before much more is given," although, in the twentieth century, another Messenger "may be sent by the Masters of Wisdom to give final and irrefutable proofs that there exists a science called *Gupta-Vidya*."

The interim cycle between the periods of active work of the Messengers may be considered as lasting about fifty years—from the beginning to the middle of the century. A writer in *Lucifer* called it the "dark" half of the century, to which H. P. B.'s characterizations, "an age of criticism" and "an era of disenchantment," may also be applied. During this period the iconoclastic tendencies set in motion during the preceding century are exhausted, while the seeds of the cycle to come are spreading their "root system" underground.

By way of illustration, the 1830's have been described as "a decade of rumination in philosophy, . . . less a moment of creative thinking than one of spreading and assimilating the vast output of new ideas which had marked the revolutionary period." Coleridge and Carlyle were bringing German idealism to birth in England, while Emerson and other American leaders were participating in a vast

gestation of spiritual ideas. At the same time, materialism was receiving its philosophical blessing from Auguste Comte, Cabanis making popular the thesis that "the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile." The giants of nineteenth century thought had yet to come upon the stage, but the setting of the great moral struggle was in formation, the weapons being forged and the rules of combat defined. When the conflict was in full swing, Theosophy entered this arena, bringing, to all who could see, a higher synthesis.

The larger part of a century has passed since 1875. Again we are in the era of criticism and disenchantment. The student of the ever-changing world of ideas will observe many analogies between the corresponding periods of this and the last century, but because of the *universal* character of the mission of H. P. B., the destructive forces now having play must, by natural reaction, precipitate far greater cataclysmic effects. And, for the same reason, the lines of the mid-century effort, represented in this epoch by the objective continuity of the Theosophical Movement, are defined with greater clarity against the background of moral and social disorder.

There is the further consideration that the present cycle is not simply a repetition of the past—one step higher on the centenary spiral—but a period marked at its beginning by other great conjunctions. The first five thousand years of *Kali Yuga* came to a close at about the beginning of this century, and the Messianic cycle of Pisces gave way to the Aquarian Age. During the latter, H. P. B. wrote, "the psychic idiosyncrasies of humanity will enter on a great change." These are the causal factors that explain scientifically why "*everything* in philosophy, religion and science is changing."

The actual processes of this universal transition should be a subject of intense interest and study for theosophists. The work of the Movement is threefold: to clear the ground, to fertilize and prepare the soil, and, most important of all, to plant seeds of truth in the open furrow. This last task falls only to conscious servants of the Theosophic Cause, who have, however, many unconscious collaborators in the indirect and preparatory phases of the Movement. It is necessary to recognize the identity of these "Theosophists unaware," to appreciate the significance of their labors, so that they may have the unseen but mighty encouragement of sympathetic support, and their contributions be used to full advantage. Finally, there is the great hope that as the lines of the Movement slowly come together, constituting the foundation for the next great evolutionary impulse, some, at least, of these "figures" of the Transition Age may be drawn into closer communion with the Theosophic fraternity, and join their wills to the one spiritual Will which keeps this Movement in being.

# THE FIELD-WORK OF MIND

## I

THE higher functions and potential powers of the human mind are immeasurably greater than an ordinary, an "intellectual" study of the subject can suggest. He who would learn truly of mind must gain at least a working control of thought, before the depths beyond this shadow screen are to be investigated; otherwise the Theosophical doctrines relating to *Manas* remain to him but logical postulates. To know the teachings, one must lead the life. Follow this advice, the Teachers say, and ample evidence will present itself that mind acts in a field of its own, and in many directions hitherto unknown. Once the deeper, motivating impulses are revealed, and surface thoughts purified, thinking can be correlated with the activities of higher mind.

All the higher mental processes take place on a plane above the physical or intellectual, making it necessary to use special forms of speech for adequate expression relative to that plane. The metaphysical idiom, thought to be impractical and obscure by many, is in fact the only practical way to convey ideas about the spiritual man. An analogy from everyday life will help to clarify the application of the metaphysical idiom. The modern use of "graphs" is familiar to everyone. The graph gives easily comprehensible representation of statistical data. A simple curve reveals relationships that the mind instantly grasps and which otherwise would take long effort to appreciate from a study of statistics and factual notations. In philosophy, the graphic symbols to convey the correlated import of wide research are provided by metaphysics.

A dream also has the character of a graph, or glyph, which, drawing the materials of representation from memory, gives to the mind —awake—a summation of sensations, thoughts, or a lesson. Dreams, too, like the graphic curve or "function," fluctuate up or down from normal waking perception; but, upon waking, the mind trained in true metaphysics knows intuitively the meaning of the symbol. Thus the dream, objective to the perceiver, becomes subjective and metaphysical to the awakened mind through its symbology.

But to visualize and study consciously the deeper functions of Manas, its field of action being beyond that of the purely physical, a mental picture or metaphysical glyph painted in words is needed as a means of expressing the truths. The injunction, "Thou hast to

study the voidness of the seeming full, the fullness of the seeming void," is cast in such an ideative form. *The Voice of the Silence* is written in a spiritual idiom, and its figures of speech should be fixed in the memory so as to guide and orient the mind in its quest for true understanding. Such word-pictures are universal in application. To the lower mind, dulled by sensuous life, the busy thoroughfare of spirit is a void; but the field of ideation beyond the senses is the higher mind's true field of action.

The embodied ego lives in a mighty current of matter which returns to him in each life, attracted by the affinities established under karmic law. The raw material of physical existence is drawn to him in hierarchical streams corresponding to the four principles of the lower or psycho-physical instrument. There are also states of substance which relate directly to the ego, or spiritual man. Being metaphysical —above the physical—this material is spoken of in its aggregate as forming a *vesture* rather than "body." Of this metaphysical vehicle science teaches nothing, yet in it, the mind, as it were, is "at home." Ordinarily, we are as little aware of the correlations of what we know as thought, and of the vibrant field in which mind retains its delicate balance, as we are of what goes on in the mind of the ant, though the results of the ant's consciousness are plainly visible to anyone who wishes to observe. So it is with the individual: he becomes aware by observation in the realm of his own consciousness, and, if he so wills, of the inner action of mind.

The field where higher mind is master does, however, reveal itself graphically at times. There is in science unique evidence to show how this may occur. The eminent German chemist Kekulé tells of an experience which led to his diagrammatic representation of molecular constitutions, elucidating the principle known as the doctrine of *valency* (the combining capacity of atoms). He was entering London from a suburb—

> One fine summer evening, I was returning by the last omnibus, "outside" as usual, through the deserted streets of the metropolis, which are at other times so full of life. I fell into a reverie, and lo! the atoms were gambolling before my eyes! Whenever, hitherto, these diminutive beings had appeared to me, they had always been in motion; but up to that time, I had never been able to discern the nature of their motion. Now, however, I saw how, frequently, two smaller ones united to form a pair; how a larger one embraced two smaller ones; how still larger ones kept hold of three or four of the smaller ones; whilst the whole kept whirling in a giddy dance. I saw how larger ones formed a chain. . . . I spent part of the night putting on paper at least sketches of these dream-forms.

Later, in Ghent, he had another dream. Again he saw the atoms gambolling before his eyes, the chains twining and twisting in snake-like motion. "But look! What was that? One of the snakes had seized his tail, and the form whirled mockingly before my eyes. As if by a flash of lightning I awoke. . . ." The picture Kekulé saw gave him the clue to the then puzzling problem of molecular structure. He remarks wisely in closing: "Let us learn to dream, then perhaps we shall find the truth. But let us beware of publishing our dreams before they have been put to the proof by the waking understanding."

This bit of "scientific" discovery, related in Findlay's *Chemistry in the Service of Man,* was of basic importance to modern chemistry. That the immemorial symbol of the serpent biting its tail figured in Kekulé's dream, adds, for the Theosophist, far greater significance to the incident. It reveals how a symbol may serve as the bridge connecting two or more states of consciousness by becoming the image through which ideas are transmitted from the metaphysical to the physical plane.

A parallel is drawn in one of the few diagrams of *The Secret Doctrine* between man's lower principles and the four basic chemical elements, hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen, and carbon—the three motivating spiritual principles being placed above. In the occult laboratory of the lower man, these four groupings may become the key to an understanding of the action and nature of the constantly changing myriads of lives that make up the physical man, which, to use the words of the *Ocean,* retain "the stamp or photographic impression of the human being." In the notes accompanying this diagram it is recalled the hydrogen burns in oxygen, giving off the most intense heat of any substance in combustion, and forming water, the most stable of compounds. Hydrogen parallels *Kama,* the principle of animal desire, which burns fiercely during life in matter, resulting in satiety. But just as hydrogen may burn in oxygen, or may combine with it to form the most stable of compounds, so thought may set Kama afire, or may stabilize this balance principle in man.

What, then, is hydrogen? "That which hydrogen is to the elements and gases on the objective plane, its noumenon is in the world of mental or subjective phenomena." This noumenon is called "Spiritual Fire," the metaphysical symbol of the Higher Self in its direct relationship with mind and with matter. Through its power, matter may be raised to the self-conscious state—prepared by refinement to receive impressions from the higher nature. This is the law of moral evolution, its dynamic process; man has the power to choose between the Spiritual Fire—the knowledge from above—and the consuming flame of Kama. Choosing rightly, the countless lives he uses receive

the benefit; made to serve the tyrannical kamic principle, they are deprived of their birthright and thrown back into the lower kingdoms.

From one point of view, all nature is moral; the lives of the various kingdoms act in harmony with their own nature. This principle is illustrated in the fact that molecular combinations are controlled by rigid mathematical law. The structure of the benzine molecule, disclosed to Kekulé in his dream of the serpent biting its tail, is a ring of six carbon atoms, to each of which one hydrogen atom is attached. This geometrical or spatial arrangement never varies. Unchanging mathematical arrangement is now known to be the pattern of all molecular structures. Man, on the other hand, in his mental sphere, transfers the lawlessness of his own turbulent nature to the matter in his body, bringing upon himself sickness and disease. He corrupts the stuff of his mind to such an extent that inner disharmony prevails. He is unmoral in thought and far too often immoral in action. Kama, therefore, burns until satiety is reached. But there is always the possibility of moral law becoming as absolute in mental life as the rule of mathematical law over molecular structure. We have first to know the law, then apply it.

The channels to Higher Manas must be discovered by each one for himself, for he alone has obscured them in the past. The technique of this operation is vividly set forth in *The Voice of the Silence,* but all techniques must be learned and practiced by the individual. Thought constantly affects the matter entrusted to us during the span of life, and in future incarnations we shall have to use the same material again and feel the effects of our present thinking. Only as this field of noumena is consciously explored, its laws understood, can the raising up of matter to higher levels proceed with purpose and efficiency, and the mind be trained to work by the light of Spiritual Fire.

(*To be continued*)

---

## Practical Occultism

*I can believe in the idea of continual progress of the soul in higher spheres, but cannot understand the idea of its returning again and again to this same earth: can Theosophists give any reason for the latter?*

W. Q. J.—Ought to be answered by politely requesting the querent to read what has been for years written hereupon, and after having digested it, then to see if the question is not answered.

—*The Vahan,* June 1, 1892.

# WHAT IS THEOSOPHY?

*By* H. P. Blavatsky

THIS question has been so often asked, and misconception so widely prevails, that the editors of a journal devoted to an exposition of the world's Theosophy would be remiss were its first number issued without coming to a full understanding with their readers. But our heading involves two further queries: What is the Theosophical Society; and what are the Theosophists? To each an answer will be given.

According to lexicographers, the term *theosophia* is composed of two Greek words—*theos,* "god," and *sophos,* "wise." So far, correct. But the explanations that follow are far from giving a clear idea of Theosophy. Webster defines it most originally as "a supposed intercourse with God and superior spirits, and consequent attainment of superhuman knowledge, by *physical processes,* as by the theurgic operations of some ancient Platonists, or by the *chemical processes* of the German fire-philosophers."

This, to say the least, is a poor and flippant explanation. To attribute such ideas to men like Ammonius Saccas, Plotinus, Jamblichus, Porphyry, Proclus—shows either intentional misrepresentation, or Mr. Webster's ignorance of the philosophy and motives of the greatest geniuses of the later Alexandrian School. To impute to those whom their contemporaries as well as posterity styled "theodidaktoi," god-taught—a purpose to develop their psychological, spiritual perceptions by "physical processes," is to describe them as materialists. As to the concluding fling at the fire-philosophers, it rebounds from them to fall home among our most eminent modern men of science; those, in whose mouths the Rev. James Martineau places the following boast: "matter is all we want; give us atoms alone, and we will explain the universe."

Vaughan offers a far better, more philosophical definition. "A Theosophist," he says—"is one who gives you a theory of God or the works of God, which has not revelation, but an inspiration of his own for its basis." In this view every great thinker and philosopher, especially every founder of a new religion, school of philosophy, or sect, is necessarily a Theosophist. Hence, Theosophy and Theosophists have existed ever since the first glimmering of nascent thought made man seek instinctively for the means of expressing his own independent opinions.

There were Theosophists before the Christian era, notwithstanding that the Christian writers ascribe the development of the Eclectic

---

Note.—This article first appeared in the *Theosophist* for October, 1879.

theosophical system, to the early part of the third century of their Era. Diogenes Laertius traces Theosophy to an epoch antedating the dynasty of the Ptolemies; and names as its founder an Egyptian Hierophant called Pot-Amun, the name being Coptic and signifying a priest consecrated to Amun, the god of Wisdom. But history shows it revived by Ammonius Saccas, the founder of the Neo-Platonic School. He and his disciples called themselves "Philalethians"—lovers of the truth; while others termed them the "Analogists," on account of their method of interpreting all sacred legends, symbolical myths and mysteries, by a rule of analogy or correspondence, so that events which had occurred in the external world were regarded as expressing operations and experiences of the human soul. It was the aim and purpose of Ammonius to reconcile all sects, peoples and nations under one common faith—a belief in one Supreme Eternal, Unknown, and Unnamed Power, governing the Universe by immutable and eternal laws. His object was to prove a primitive system of Theosophy, which at the beginning was essentially alike in all countries; to induce all men to lay aside their strifes and quarrels, and unite in purpose and thought as the children of one common mother; to purify the ancient religions, by degrees corrupted and obscured, from all dross of human element, by uniting and expounding them upon pure philosophical principles. Hence, the Buddhistic, Vedantic and Magian, or Zoroastrian, systems were taught in the Eclectic Theosophical School along with all the philosophies of Greece. Hence also, that pre-eminently Buddhistic and Indian feature among the ancient Theosophists of Alexandria, of due reverence for parents and aged persons; a fraternal affection for the whole human race; and a compassionate feeling for even the dumb animals. While seeking to establish a system of moral discipline which enforced upon people the duty to live according to the laws of their respective countries; to exalt their minds by the research and contemplation of the one Absolute Truth; his chief object in order, as he believed, to achieve all others, was to extract from the various religious teachings, as from a many-chorded instrument, one full and harmonious melody, which would find response in every truth-loving heart.

Theosophy is, then, the archaic *Wisdom-Religion,* the esoteric doctrine once known in every ancient country having claims to civilization. This "Wisdom" all the old writings show us as an emanation of the divine Principle; and the clear comprehension of it is typified in such names as the Indian Buddh, the Babylonian Nebo, the Thoth of Memphis, the Hermes of Greece; in the appellations, also, of some goddesses—Metis, Neitha, Athena, the Gnostic *Sophia,* and finally—the Vedas, from the word "to know." Under this designation, all the

ancient philosophers of the East and West, the Hierophants of old Egypt, the Rishis of Aryavart, the Theodidaktoi of Greece, included all knowledge of things occult and essentially divine. The *Mercavah* of the Hebrew Rabbis, the secular and popular series, were thus designated as only the vehicle, the outward shell which contained the higher esoteric knowledge. The Magi of Zoroaster received instruction and were initiated in the caves and secret lodges of Bactria; the Egyptian and Grecian hierophants had their *apporrheta,* or secret discourses, during which the *Mysta* became an *Epopta*—a Seer.

The central idea of the Eclectic Theosophy was that of a simple Supreme Essence, Unknown and *Unknowable*—for—"How could one know the knower?" as enquires *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad.* Their system was characterized by three distinct features: the theory of the above-named Essence; the doctrine of the human soul—an emanation from the latter, hence of the same nature; and its theurgy. It is this last science which has led the Neo-Platonists to be so misrepresented in our era of materialistic science. Theurgy being essentially the art of applying the divine powers of man to the subordination of the blind forces of nature, its votaries were first termed magicians—a corruption of the word "Magh," signifying a wise, or learned man, and—derided. Skeptics of a century ago would have been as wide of the mark if they had laughed at the idea of a phonograph or telegraph. The ridiculed and the "infidels" of one generation generally become the wise men and saints of the next.

As regards the Divine essence and the nature of the soul and spirit, modern Theosophy believes now as ancient Theosophy did. The popular *Diu* of the Aryan nations was identical with the *Iao* of the Chaldeans, and even with the Jupiter of the less learned and philosophical among the Romans; and it was just as identical with the *Jahve* of the Samaritans, the *Tiu* or "Tiusco" of the Northmen, the Duw of the Britains, and the Zeus of the Thracians. As to the Absolute Essence, the One and all—whether we accept the Greek Pythagorean, the Chaldean Kabalistic, or the Aryan philosophy in regard to it, it will all lead to one and the same result. The Primeval Monad of the Pythagorean system, which retires into darkness and is itself Darkness (for human intellect) was made the basis of all things; and we can find the idea in all its integrity in the philosophical systems of Leibnitz and Spinoza. Therefore, whether a Theosophist agrees with the Kabala which, speaking of En-Soph propounds the query: "Who then, can comprehend It since It is formless, and Non-existent?"—or, remembering that magnificent hymn from the Rig-Veda (Hymn 129th, Book 10th)—enquire:

"Who knows from whence this great creation sprang?
Whether his will created or was mute.
He knows it—or perchance *even He knows not.*"

Or again, accepts the Vedantic conception of Brahma, who in the *Upanishads* is represented as "without life, without mind, pure," *unconscious,* for—Brahma is "Absolute Consciousness." Or, even finally, siding with the Svabhâvikas of Nepaul, maintains that nothing exists but "Svabhâvât" (substance or nature) which exists by *itself* without any creator—any one of the above conceptions can lead but to pure and absolute Theosophy. That Theosophy which prompted such men as Hegel, Fichte and Spinoza to take up the labors of the old Grecian philosophers and speculate upon the One Substance—the Deity, the *Divine All* proceeding from the Divine Wisdom—incomprehensible, unknown and *unnamed*—by any ancient or modern religious philosophy, with the exception of Christianity and Mahommedanism. Every Theosophist, then, holding to a theory of the Deity "which has not revelation, but an inspiration of his own for its basis," may accept any of the above definitions or belong to any of these religions, and yet remain strictly within the boundaries of Theosophy. For the latter is belief in the Deity as the ALL, the source of all existence, the infinite that cannot be either comprehended or known, the universe alone revealing *It,* or, as some prefer it, Him, thus giving a sex to that, to anthropomorphize which is *blasphemy.* True, Theosophy shrinks from brutal materialization; it prefers believing that, from eternity retired within itself, the Spirit of the Deity neither wills nor creates; but that, from the infinite effulgency everywhere going forth from the Great Centre, that which produces all visible and invisible things, is but a Ray containing in itself the generative and conceptive power, which, in its turn, produces that which the Greeks called *Macrocosm,* the Kabalists *Tikkun* or Adam Kadmon—the archetypal man, and the Aryans *Purusha,* the manifested Brahm, or the Divine Male. Theosophy believes also in the *Anastasis* or continued existence, and in transmigration (evolution) or a series of changes in the soul[1] which can be defended and explained on strict philosophical principles; and only by making a distinction between *Paramâtma* (transcendental, supreme soul) and *Jivâtmâ* (animal, or conscious soul) of the Vedantins.

To fully define Theosophy, we must consider it under all its aspects. The interior world has not been hidden from all by impenetrable

[1] In a series of articles entitled "The World's Great Theosophists," we intend showing that from Pythagoras, who got his wisdom in India, down to our best known modern philosophers and theosophists—David Hume, and Shelley, the English poet—the Spiritists of France included—many believed and yet believe in metempsychosis or reincarnation of the soul; however unelaborated the system of the Spiritists may fairly be regarded.

darkness. By that higher intuition acquired by *Theosophia*—or God-knowledge, which carried the mind from the world of form into that of formless spirit, man has been sometimes enabled in every age and every country to perceive things in the interior or invisible world. Hence, the "Samadhi," or *Dyan Yog Samadhi,* of the Hindu ascetics; the "Daimonion-photi," or spiritual illumination of the Neo-Platonists; the "Sidereal confabulation of soul," of the Rosicrucians or Fire-philosophers; and, even the ecstatic trance of mystics and of the modern mesmerists and spiritualists, are identical in nature, though various as to manifestation. The search after man's diviner "self," so often and so erroneously interpreted as individual communion with a personal God, was the object of every mystic, and belief in its possibility seems to have been coeval with the genesis of humanity, — each people giving it another name. Thus Plato and Plotinus call "Noëtic work" that which the Yogas and the Shrotriya term *Vidya.* "By reflection, self-knowledge and intellectual discipline, the soul can be raised to the vision of eternal truth, goodness, and beauty—that is, to the *Vision of God*—this is the *epopteia,"* said the Greeks. "To unite one's soul to the Universal Soul," says Porphyry, "requires but a perfectly pure mind. Through self-contemplation, perfect chastity, and purity of body, we may approach nearer to It, and receive, in that state, true knowledge and wonderful insight." And Swami Dayànund Saraswati, who has read neither Porphyry nor other Greek authors, but who is a thorough Vedic scholar, says in his *Veda Bhâshya* (opasna prakaru ank. 9)—"To obtain Diksh (highest initiation) and *Yog,* one has to practise according to the rules . . . The soul in human body can perform the greatest wonders by knowing the Universal Spirit (or God) and acquainting itself with the properties and qualities (occult) of all the things in the universe. A human being (a *Dikshit* or initiate) can thus *acquire a power of seeing and hearing at great distances."* Finally, Alfred R. Wallace, F. R. S., a spiritualist and yet a confessedly great naturalist, says, with brave candour: "It is 'spirit' that alone feels, and perceives, and thinks—that acquires knowledge, and reasons and aspires . . . there not unfrequently occur individuals so constituted that the spirit can perceive independently of the corporeal organs of sense, or can perhaps, wholly or partially, quit the body for a time and return to it again . . . the spirit . . . communicates with spirit easier than with matter." We can now see how, after thousands of years have intervened between the age of Gymnosophists[2] and our own highly civil-

[2] The reality of the Yog-power was affirmed by many Greek and Roman writers, who call the Yogins Indian Gymnosophists; by Strabo, Lucan, Plutarch, Cicero (*Tusculum*), Pliny (vii, 2), etc.

ized era, notwithstanding, or, perhaps, just because of such an enlightenment which pours its radiant light upon the psychological as well as upon the physical realms of nature, over twenty millions of people today believe, under a different form, in those same spiritual powers that were believed in by the Yogins and the Pythagoreans, nearly 3,000 years ago. Thus, while the Aryan mystic claimed for himself the power of solving all the problems of life and death, when he had once obtained the power of acting independently of his body, through the *Atmân*—"self," or "soul"; and the old Greeks went in search of *Atmu*—the Hidden one, or the God-Soul of man, with the symbolical mirror of the Thesmophorian mysteries; — so the spiritualists of today believe in the faculty of the spirits, or the souls of the disembodied persons, to communicate visibly and tangibly with those they loved on earth. And all these, Aryan Yogis, Greek philosophers, and modern spiritualists, affirm that possibility on the ground that the embodied soul and its never embodied spirit—the real *self,* are not separated from either the Universal Soul or other spirits by space, but merely by the differentiation of their qualities; as in the boundless expanse of the universe there can be no limitation. And that when this difference is once removed—according to the Greeks and Aryans by abstract contemplation, producing the temporary liberation of the imprisoned Soul; and according to spiritualists, through mediumship—such an union between embodied and disembodied spirits becomes possible. Thus was it that Patanjali's Yogis and, following in their steps, Plotinus, Porphyry and other Neo-Platonists, maintained that in their hours of ecstacy, they had been united to, or rather become as one with God, several times during the course of their lives. This idea, erroneous as it may seem in its application to the Universal Spirit, was, and is, claimed by too many great philosophers to be put aside as entirely chimerical. In the case of the Theodidaktoi, the only controvertible point, the dark spot on this philosophy of extreme mysticism, was its claim to include that which is simply ecstatic illumination, under the head of sensuous perception. In the case of the Yogins, who maintained their ability to see Iswara "face to face," this claim was successfully overthrown by the stern logic of Kapila. As to the similar assumption made for their Greek followers, for a long array of Christian ecstatics, and, finally, for the last two claimants to "God-seeing" within these last hundred years—Jacobe Böhme and Swedenborg—this pretension would and *should* have been philosophically and logically questioned, if a few of our great men of science who are spiritualists had had more interest in the philosophy than in the mere phenomenalism of spiritualism.

The Alexandrian Theosophists were divided into neophytes, initiates, and masters, or hierophants; and their rules were copied from the ancient Mysteries of Orpheus, who, according to Herodotus, brought them from India. Ammonius obligated his disciples by oath not to divulge his *higher* doctrines, except to those who were proved thoroughly worthy and initiated, and who had learned to regard the gods, the angels, and the demons of other peoples, according to the esoteric *hyponia,* or under-meaning. "The gods exist, but they are not what the *hoi polloi,* the uneducated multitude, suppose them to be," says Epicurus. "He is not an atheist who denies the existence of the gods whom the multitude worship, but he is such who fastens on these gods the opinions of the multitude." In his turn, Aristotle declares that of the "Divine Essence pervading the whole world of nature, what are styled the *gods* are simply the first principles."

Plotinus, the pupil of the "God-taught" Ammonius, tells us, that the secret *gnosis* or the knowledge of Theosophy, has three degrees—opinion, science, and *illumination.* "The means or instrument of the first is sense, or perception; of the second, dialectics; of the third, intuition. To the last, reason is subordinate; it is *absolute knowledge,* founded on the identification of the mind with the object known." Theosophy is the exact science of psychology, so to say; it stands in relation to natural, uncultivated mediumship, as the knowledge of a Tyndall stands to that of a school-boy in physics. It develops in man a direct beholding; that which Schelling denominates "a realization of the identity of subject and object in the individual"; so that under the influence and knowledge of *hyponia* man thinks divine thoughts, views all things as they really are, and, finally, "becomes recipient of the Soul of the World," to use one of the finest expressions of Emerson. "I, the imperfect, adore my own perfect"—he says in his superb Essay on the *Oversoul.* Besides this psychological, or soul-state, Theosophy cultivated every branch of sciences and arts. It was thoroughly familiar with what is now commonly known as mesmerism. Practical theurgy or "ceremonial magic," so often resorted to in their exorcisms by the Roman Catholic clergy—was discarded by the theosophists. It is but Jamblichus alone who, transcending the other Eclectics, added to Theosophy the doctrine of Theurgy. When ignorant of the true meaning of the esoteric divine symbols of nature, man is apt to miscalculate the powers of his soul, and, instead of communing spiritually and mentally with the higher, celestial beings, the good spirits (the gods of the theurgists of the Platonic school), he will unconsciously call forth the evil, dark powers which lurk around humanity—the undying, grim creations of human crimes and

vices—and thus fall from *theurgia* (white magic) into *göetia* (or black magic, sorcery). Yet, neither white, nor black magic are what popular superstition understands by the terms. The possibility of "raising spirits" according to the key of Solomon, is the height of superstition and ignorance. Purity of deed and thought can alone raise us to an intercourse "with the gods" and attain for us the goal we desire. Alchemy, believed by so many to have been a spiritual philosophy as well as physical science, belonged to the teachings of the theosophical school.

It is a noticeable fact that neither Zoroaster, Buddha, Orpheus, Pythagoras, Confucius, Socrates, nor Ammonius Saccas, committed anything to writing. The reason for it is obvious. Theosophy is a double-edged weapon and unfit for the ignorant or the selfish. Like every ancient philosophy it has its votaries among the moderns; but, until late in our own days, its disciples were few in numbers, and of the most various sects and opinions. "Entirely speculative, and founding no school, they have still exercised a silent influence upon philosophy; and no doubt, when the time arrives, many ideas thus silently propounded may yet give new directions to human thought"—remarks Mr. Kenneth R. H. Mackenzie IX° . . . himself a mystic and a Theosophist, in his large and valuable work, *The Royal Masonic Cyclopoedia* (articles *Theosophical Society of New York* and *Theosophy,* p. 731).[3] Since the days of the fire-philosophers, they had never formed themselves into societies, for, tracked like wild beasts by the Christian clergy, to be known as a Theosophist often amounted, hardly a century ago, to a death-warrant. The statistics show that, during a period of 150 years, no less than 90,000 men and women were burned in Europe for alleged witchcraft. In Great Britain only, from A. D. 1640 to 1660, but twenty years, 3,000 persons were put to death for compact with the "Devil." It was but late in the present century—in 1875—that some progressed mystics and spiritualists, unsatisfied with the theories and explanations of Spiritualism, started by its votaries, and finding that they were far from covering the whole ground of the wide range of phenomena, formed at New York, America, an association which is now widely known as the Theosophical Society. And now, having explained what is Theosophy, we will, in a separate article, explain what is the nature of our Society, which is also called the "Universal Brotherhood of Humanity."

---

[3] *The Royal Masonic Cyclopoedia of History, Rites, Symbolism, and Biography.* Edited by Kenneth R. H. Mackenzie IX° (Cryptonymous), Hon. Member of the Canongate Kilwinning Lodge, No. 2, Scotland. New York, J. W. Bouton, 706, Broadway, 1877.

# QUESTIONS ON EVOLUTION

QUESTION: Theosophy considers evolution a universal process, applying to all the "kingdoms" of nature. Applied to inorganic forms, however, this proposition seems to me an absurdity. Can you conceive of a rock evolving or growing?

Certainly rocks grow. They *are*. There was a time when they were not. Therefore they either came into being through a miracle or through growth. We know that rocks don't grow in the same way plants and animals do. A good analogy may be found by turning to arithmetic. Numbers exist as units or integers. Any number is an integer, that is, has an identity of its own, but is not necessarily a unit. How are numbers formed? How else than by addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. How else, then, are the various kingdoms in nature formed? Very clearly, the mineral kingdom is formed by addition and subtraction, and just as evidently the plant kingdom is formed by multiplication. Just as clearly the animal or human kingdom, physically speaking, is formed by addition, subtraction, multiplication and division.

Minerals become plants, plants become animals, animals become humans, and humans become "Gods" only in an analogical sense, as we say the sun rises and sets. The sun neither rises nor sets, but in relation to the earth appears to do both. It is the earth which turns and not the sun, but the sun *appears* to turn, to the earth inhabitant for whom the earth appears to stand still. A mineral no more becomes a plant than a piece of paper becomes a "first reader." A plant no more becomes an animal than a first reader becomes a second reader.

The Life, or Soul, or Being, or Ego, in a given state of consciousness, or form, seems to other beings in the same state to be identical with the form. When the being leaves that form and enters another, the form dissolves and the Ego, the Perceiver, immediately finds itself in another state of form, not visible to the beings that remain in the preceding state. Physically, then, no form reincarnates, since all forms are compound, but the elements which were assembled in one form, re-assemble in a similar or different form. Forms do not progress, but combinations of them do, and progress in understanding the combinations of forms constitutes intellectual evolution. In the same way, no intellectual form progresses. The progress is in the understanding of ideas, and this is spiritual evolution. It follows, then, that at all times the Soul is the Evolver, and the various kingdoms are what he evolves.

The same Soul, or Monad, which now we name Man, is under other conditions given other names, but if the word "Man" be taken to mean self-consciousness—its spiritual meaning—then it should be clear that there is no self-consciousness in the kingdoms below man. So the kingdoms below man do not become men any more than ignorance becomes knowledge, but the being which now has a given degree of knowledge is called Man. When that same being had a lesser degree of knowledge he was given other names; he will be given still other names when he reaches a higher degree of knowledge than the human. This brings us back to the real meaning of the word "being," which is spiritual: Being means, *Spirit, plus knowledge.*

QUESTION: What is the relation in man between Manas, the mind-principle, and the "three lines of evolution" spoken of in *The Secret Doctrine?*

Our body, astral body, and Prana, represent physical evolution. Our conscious memories, desires and thoughts represent astral or psychic evolution; our self-consciousness represents spiritual evolution. These three are all conjoined in one single principle—Manas, the reasoning power, which can act in union with the ensouling element of physical evolution—Kama; or it can act in union with the ensouling principle of spiritual evolution—Buddhi; or with the ensouling principle of all evolution—Atma-Buddhi. Thus Manas, as is said in *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 254 fn.), is triple in its nature. It can act as an individually self-conscious Monad; it can act in unison with all individually self-conscious Monads—Atma-Buddhi; or it can act in unison with the non-self-conscious Monads. When it acts with the latter it is a purely human being. When it acts with the former it is the Adept, or Mahatma. When it acts as a Perceiver, Chooser and Thinker on its own account, then it is the "Ego" with which we are familiar in our greatest men.

QUESTION: What is the purpose of the psycho-physical evolution that takes place on earth before man incarnates?

*The Secret Doctrine* (I, 247) shows that during the first half of a Manvantara, there are two streams or processes—the descending stream of spiritual involution and the ascending stream of physical evolution. Since these two streams proceed from opposite poles of Life, it follows that the time comes when they meet, mingle and merge, which union is caused by the descent of the Manasa Putras. Up to the middle of the Third Round, the two streams do not consciously fuse. The purely spiritual beings work in, on and through "matter"—the stream of physical evolution—but cannot unite with it because the purely spiritual beings have no principles in common with the beings immersed in the stream of physical evolu-

tion. Only the Manasa Putras can unite the two streams, because the reincarnating Egos have all the principles of the purely spiritual beings (Atma-Buddhi-Manas) and the two higher principles of the physical stream—desire and the Life Principle. In *The Secret Doctrine* (I, 181), the three lines of evolution are clearly stated. They were originally three separate streams and were not "interwoven and interblended" until the Manasa Putras incarnated—that is, woke up and went to work.

Each time anyone now reincarnates he repeats in the nine months before birth all the processes of the two streams of evolution, spiritual and physical, which in the beginning took three and a half rounds. In other words, during the entire antenatal period, the spiritual Ego is descending towards incarnation, and the embryo represents in itself the successive stages of physical evolution. All that takes place in the nine months before birth is again repeated in another way during the seven or nine years after birth, just as all that went on in the first three and a half Rounds is recapitulated in the first three and a half Races of this globe. That is why it is said that the growing child begins to be a responsible being at about seven years of age.

---

## GODS FOR GOOD OR EVIL

It is only at the mid-point of the 3rd Root Race that man was endowed with *Manas*. Once united, the *two* and then the *three* made one; for though the lower animals, from the amœba to man, received *their* monads, in which all the higher qualities are potential, all have to remain dormant till each reaches its human form, before which stage *manas* (mind) has no development in them. Men are made *complete* only during their third, toward the fourth cycle (race). They are made "gods" for good and evil, and responsible only when the two arcs meet (after 3½ rounds towards the *fifth* Race). They are made so by the *Nirmânakaya* (spiritual or astral remains) of the Rudra-Kumâras, "*cursed* to be reborn on earth again; meaning—*doomed in their natural turn to reincarnation* in the higher ascending arc of the terrestrial cycle." In the animals every principle is paralyzed, and in a foetus-like state, save the second (vital) and the third (the astral), and the rudiments of the fourth (*Kama,* which is desire, instinct) whose intensity and development varies and changes with the species. To the materialist wedded to the Darwinian theory, this will read like a fairy-tale, a mystification; to the believer in the inner, spiritual man, the statement will have nothing unnatural in it.

—*The Secret Doctrine.*

# MOTIVE AND A LIVING FAITH

MOTIVE is declared through acts of will, through practice rather than by profession. A perception of this truth has ever driven men to seek "counsels of perfection" within themselves and so to embody an inner faith. Great humanitarians and the prophets of great religions have illustrated this verity through action; yet the masses of men have been willing to benefit from the motive force of their leaders without partaking of the struggle, without the will to pass through the personal torments of self-sacrifice, to take the kingdom of *heaven* by violence, that peace and good will might reign on earth.

Christ and Buddha taught that a sharp sword must be wielded against personal desires and incomplete understanding, but only a few answer such a call to arms. Do great teachers expect a wholesale devotion to their selfless cause? They would not be sages, did they not perceive that æons of time are needed for man's spiritual development, nor would they be lovers of mankind if they did not also perceive that brotherhood for the many must begin with brotherhood among the few. So they keep the path of spiritual progress clearly marked for those who strive to find it, its bridges ready to support the weight of those who summon the will needed for the first step.

When may this first step be taken? When motive is pure. Pure motive enlightens both ends and means. And how may men know when they reach this purity of motive that is the heart of all progress? Only when their many partial and divergent desires have been supplanted by one impartial desire to live for the benefit of all men and creatures throughout the world. Then the voice of intuition dissociates itself from that of the personal self. Intuition is a glimpse of spiritual interdependence, a perception of things as they are; pure motive is the desire to order the relations of life to conform with this perception—the desire to become a beneficent and co-operative force in the common evolutionary process, and to adjust relations with those united by Karmic bonds to the personal self. This motive is more than *a* motivation. It is a vow to the higher self, the one lawful desire behind which stands the force of spiritual will.

The vision fades if concentration turns again to the desires rather than to the needs of Selves, but if the personal ego is forced to co-operation with the wakening god within, the "Self gets wisdom and gets understanding." Then has one been found who will become the embodiment of a living faith.

# SCIENCE AND THE SECRET DOCTRINE

ANUPADAKA

## I

IN this year 1941, a condition exists which is unprecedented in science. *There is a major problem for which no current theory is accepted as an explanation.* The period through which this Magazine has been published presents no similar case. A close study of the scientific commentaries in *The Secret Doctrine,* and a review of the literature back to those days, likewise show no similar phenomenon, though it is clear that nearly all theories have been kaleidoscopic in their alterations.

This instance must be particularly painful to those—of whom few are now scientists—who regard "science" as infallible.

Long since, man has been rendered parentless (*anupadaka*) in science by the substitution of an animal—no agreement as to what kind of animal—for his true ancestor. Now his planetary habitation is found to be parentless, too, for there is no theory satisfactory, even to a few, for the explanation of the origin of the solar system. We are not acquainted with any definite, categorical statement of that fact; but for the past year or two it has been seeping up from the scientific underworld of doubt and discrepancy, in the form of questionings, criticisms, veiled references, until at last the fact has become clear.

There have actually been only two major theories on this subject, aside from the disdained Theosophical truth. Others have been only variations.

The first was Laplace's Nebular Hypothesis, which was proclaimed to have "rendered God useless." It is not necessary here to point out the lingering and painful ways by which this hypothesis arrived at a final end at least twenty years ago. There are voluminous sections in *The Secret Doctrine* which show how vulnerable the whole theory was, even from the point of view of pure rationality. The expiring struggles were marked by an attempt to show that it had never been universally accepted anyway. At any rate, it is a fact of painful knowledge to Theosophists that the Nebular Hypothesis was accepted so far as to be a weapon of scientific excommunication for Madame Blavatsky and all that she taught.

The theory which gradually succeeded it had several branches, but all depended upon the close approach to our sun of another star.

Prof. Kirtley F. Mather sums up the situation of the new theory's proponents in the following words:

> In his book "The Solar System and Its Origin," Henry Norris Russell presents a critique of the several theories of earth origin, which may fairly be taken as representative of the attitude of most astronomers toward this problem, responsibility for the solution of which they share with geologists. Full consideration is given to the planetesimal hypothesis of Chamberlin and Moulton and to the modifications of that hypothesis which have been proposed by Jeffreys and Jeans. The obstacles which forbid whole-hearted acceptance of any one of these hypotheses are forcefully presented. The conclusion is frankly stated "that no one can yet say how our system originated in detail."
>
> It is nevertheless apparent that the most hopeful line of research leads toward some hypothesis of origin during an encounter between the sun and another heavenly body. (*Science,* Jan. 27, 1939.)

Going on to say that the fundamental principle of the planetesimal hypothesis is "accepted," he quotes Prof. Russell as follows:

> Commenting specifically upon the planetesimal and tidal theories, Professor Russell states: "It is here that the two theories part company—the planetesimal supposing that the existing planets were formed mainly by the slow agglomeration of small cold bodies, and the tidal that they were all once liquid and have picked up much less matter in later times. This difference, while very important to the geologist, is really rather small from the standpoint of the astronomer."

Prof. Mather notes the intricate relationship between the problems of the geologist and of the astronomer in this connection; the fact that the astronomer can help the geologist but little; from here he passes to the geological investigations.

Now, of the two branches of the theory, that which most nearly approaches the Theosophical explanation is the planetesimal. The objections to it are thus of interest. Prof. Mather shows that if the earth has grown by the accretion of meteoric dust, the present rate of fall would account for only one one-hundred-and-twenty-five thousandth of the weight of the earth in two billion years. The planetesimal hypothesis assumes a former rate of infall of a hundred thousand times as great. Certainly this is logical, since the available dust and stone in space would have decreased rapidly as it was absorbed by the planets. Prof. Mather, remarking that this "throws the whole question back into the realm of speculative deduction" (What would he prefer? Personal observation?), then plunges into some speculative deductions of a more congenial nature.

Earthquake records indicate that the earth has a stratiform structure which reflects waves in a discontinuous manner. Prof. Mather claims that this structure is an argument for an originally liquid constitution, and against an origin by accretion. His most obvious argument is that a liquid earth would permit the differential settlement of light and heavy materials, which would best account for the observed wave actions. (The latter are as though the core of the earth were nickel and iron.) But Prof. Mather destroys this argument himself.

> Thus an earth originally heterogeneous and always essentially crystalline would eventually be organized into its present structural form with a central core of intrinsically dense materials surrounded by concentric shells of progressively less dense substances. At all times it would react as an elastic solid to the sudden impacts or abrupt release of energy which initiate earthquake vibrations, but at all times it would be subject to "solid flow," which would tend inevitably toward specific gravity assortment. If this is true, the existing structure of the earth's interior could be explained with equal effectiveness regardless of its origin, whether by planetesimal growth or by condensation from a gaseous "filament." This would mean that the geologist would be unable to use the earth's fundamental structure as a criterion for appraising the relative merits of the planetesimal and the tidal hypotheses.

He then falls back on arguments based on continental folding. The circumferential shrinking of the earth, he says, is still the best theory to account for mountain-raising. (In which he is in radical conflict with some of the best-known geological authorities.) We may add that such a theory can be held only by ignoring the now rather obvious phenomena of alternate rising and submersion of continental areas and their interchange of status with oceanic areas.

But, says Prof. Mather, the old theory of shrinkage by cooling (an ancient enemy of Theosophy, by the way) can be completely dismissed.

> There remains the possibility that physical and chemical reorganization of the materials composing the earth's interior has been such as to increase sufficiently their average density and thus produce the required decrease in volume for the earth as a whole. Chamberlin long ago appealed to this process in seeking an explanation for the diastrophism which produces folded and overthrust mountains. The argument is still valid. It applies, however, only to an earth constructed according to the planetesimal program; it is utterly ineffective in an earth which has solidified from a molten state. If at last we find no escape from the idea of a shrinking earth, we must render our verdict in favor of the planetesimal theory rather than the tidal.

There is a final point to be presented. The actual structure of the earth shows great heterogeneity of materials, and, most interesting, the frequent occurrence of heavier materials on top of lighter. Under the planetesimal theory, he explains, this is accounted for by selective ingathering, transportation, and deposition of different sorts of meteoric materials. Under the tidal theory, it would have to be accounted for by disturbance due to separation of the moon from the earth. (But the Pacific basin, usually suspected of having been the origin of the moon, is now known to have a totally different composition of materials.)

Prof. Mather concludes:

> Both ideas must be critically reviewed in the light of any new knowledge which may be secured in the coming years. Neither can be whole-heartedly accepted or bluntly rejected at the present moment. The line of departure between the two is so clearly defined and leads to such far-reaching consequences that there is good reason to expect a definite verdict in the near future. The bearing of that verdict upon the theories of earth origin is obvious.
>
> In summary, it would appear that the concept of earth structure based on recent geophysical and seismological research is not nearly so unfavorable to acceptance of the planetesimal theory of earth origin as many geologists have supposed it to be. On the contrary, in at least one particular—that which deals with the origin of folded mountains, — modern investigations pertaining to the fundamental structures of the earth have brought renewed confidence in the basic principles of that theory.

Actually, then, that branch of the current theory which most nearly approximates the Theosophical doctrine (in fact, forms part of it) seems to have the preponderance of evidence in its favor, geologically. But Prof. Mather is over-optimistic, to say the least.

Actually, the insuperable obstacles to both theories are in the realm of astronomy; and the worst of these is the question of angular momentum (rotation, and revolution). Calculation after calculation has shown that the circumgyratory energy involved in the rotation of the planets cannot be accounted for by any plausible theory of collision with another star, even on the liquid theory. On the accumulation theory, every speck of heterogeneously distributed dust added to a planet must decrease the velocity of its rotation, until the rotatory energy of the small original nucleus has been almost entirely absorbed. The same thing would be true of the revolution of the planets about the sun. The most plausible outcome of planetary development under such a theory would be a gigantic ball of accumulated dust, rotating very slowly or not at all. A number of objections

to these theories were summed up in articles of this series in THEOSOPHY, August and September, 1933 (XXI, 452, 509), and June, 1938 (XXVI, 349).

In a resumé of discovery for 1940, appears the statement:

> Theories that the planetary system was formed by condensation of a great gaseous mass pulled out of the sun were shown to be untenable by a demonstration that such a mass would not condense, but would dissipate. (*Science,* Dec. 27, 1940.)

What, then, is the true answer?

It involves many more difficulties of expression than any material theory, because the origin of a planet is actually not material, in the usual sense, at all; though its growth takes on later material aspects, of which the planetesimal theory may be largely a true picture. Its very beginning implies a radical upset, an irreconcilable difference, with materialism, in the postulate—for some, the *fact*—of the *organic* nature of the universe. A center of matter anywhere is of necessity a center of consciousness, because consciousness is as inseparable from substance as is mass, and *vice versa.* This fact is concealed from material observation, because consciousness in the lower forms of substance is not organized, not individual, not aware of self in the sense of individuality, and not equipped with means of expression. Behind the development of these capacities is the urgent "drive" underlying all life, motion, and evolution. Furthermore, in a planet as in an individual, consciousness emerges through several bases or *upadhis,* which are co-existent but not consubstantial in the full-blown life of the individual, and which in gestation develop serially. The magnetic field of the earth is well known scientifically. That such a field could exist *before* the physical earth, and be the cause of its accumulation, is probably as wild an idea to the scientist as the equal fact that a bio-magnetic field, pre-existent, is the cause of the formation of a physical human body. Both these phenomena belong to the same class; in fact, the generation and constitution of a human body is only the outcome and specialization of the cosmic law under which planets have come into being.

Thus a physical planet comes into existence at a given point of space because of the presence of the accumulated latent consciousness of a former world-system which has lain in *pralaya* for countless ages, and which is now to pass once more into its active phase. The first objective manifestation follows the activation of an immaterial center of fiery energy, which seizes upon and draws to itself a modicum of the surrounding dispersed matter of disintegrated planets of a former era, and, acted upon by the laws of cosmic motion, of which science has skimmed only the merest surface, sets out wildly

on a course of enormous ellipticity about the sun. This brings the nascent world into distant and different parts of space, where new and hitherto unknown forms of energy and substance are accumulated. Acquiring weight, it tends to a more settled orbit; sometimes it is destroyed by the gravitation of heavier bodies, or swallowed up in them.

> *"The Central Sun causes Fohat to collect primordial dust in the form of balls, to impel them to move in converging lines, and finally to approach each other and aggregate." (Book of Dzyan.) . . . "Being scattered in Space, without order or system, the world-germs come into frequent collision until their final aggregation, after which they become wanderers (Comets). Then the battles and struggles begin. The older (bodies) attract the younger, while others repel them. Many perish, devoured by their stronger companions. Those that escape become worlds." (The Secret Doctrine,* 1888, I, 201.)

If it survives, it grows from a comet to a planet, and enters upon "family" life; the evolution of numerous and diverse species, organically alive and in the end self-conscious. Beholding this period of accumulation by some miracle, the modern scientist would see, for *him,* the full vindication of the planetesimal theory; but it would be far from the "origin," and he could not see it with eyes of fifth race humanity. Only long, long after this initial cycle of transformations does the matter of the planet itself consolidate into the present complex system of atoms; or, to use other terms, pass from the "astral" form to the physical.

The fact that "hydrogen" has been discovered in the spectrum of Cunningham's Comet may not seem startling to a layman; but it has been so indeed to the scientist.

> If it proves correct, the new discovery will be important in the interpretation of future comets. Any new clue to their birth will contribute to understanding better one of the major unsolved puzzles of astronomy, the origin and evolution of the solar system. (*Science,* Jan. 3, 1941.)

Guess, intuition, or reason? At any rate, truth.

The solution of this problem is at present utterly impossible to science: first, because of the material outlook; second, because of the enormously complex interrelation of all forms of human knowledge, going deeply into the very nature of consciousness and intelligence, which is involved; finally, because of sheer difficulties in mere physical observation and evaluation thereof, in such a realm.

With some of these difficulties we propose to deal next.

(*To be concluded*)

# YOUTH-COMPANIONS' FORUM

THE Ocean of Theosophy *says that Manas was "lighted up" when the Elder Brothers set fire to the combined lower principles (p. 54). How did this affect, if at all, the higher triads which were already perfected? Did the lighting up of Manas create new Egos?*

The lighting up of Manas is a continuous process; it is but the awakening of the lower self to the Truth that is in the Higher Self—Self-Realization. Manas, the thinker, being part of the Divine nature, has the characteristic of fire, light, or electricity, in the highest sense of these terms. It is the active, intelligent side of nature. The Real Man is potentially complete or "perfect," always, and is absolutely independent of the lower nature for his *spiritual* existence.

As Mr. Crosbie points out, Manas is present in all life. In the lower kingdoms it is latent; in man it begins to be actively operative; in perfected man it is used to its fullest extent (*Answers to Questions*, p. 90). The child is at first "mindless," but as its parents and teachers help to awaken its soul memory, the evidences of human intelligence appear. Actually, the ego was there all the time, but the instrument had to be made ready for the manifestation of mind. So it is with the lighting up of Manas on a larger scale. The learning of the teacher is not diminished when some of that learning is imparted to the child; nor is anything taken away from the higher triads who help in the lighting-up process. The Elder Brothers work to raise the lower principles. They are only helping man do his work. They are not doing some special thing, but are like a parent who helps a child carry forward his own task.

(*b*) It is as incorrect to think of Egos being created as it would be to say that the sun creates the flowers. The combined lower principles are affected by this fusion, but not the higher nature of man. The *Ocean* says that the spiritual nature of man is unaffected by Karma. The human tabernacle lacked the fire of mind and the Elder Brothers gave it by stimulating the fire latent within. They raised the emotional nature to a higher vibration, so that the men who were not yet so wise as they might more easily enter the mindless forms. The lighting up of manas is not a process of "creating" something, but rather an *awakening* process. If one man shakes another man and wakes him from sleep, we do not think that the first man has created anything new, but that he has brought the sleeping man's attention from inner planes of consciousness to a focus on this plane of waking consciousness.

(*c*) The form of the "man to be" is the result of long periods of evolution. It is made up of armies of variously progressed entities which are gradually reaching up to higher states by playing their part in the construction of the human form. These forms are synthesized by an elemental intelligence—the Lunar Pitri—which presides over their evolution until the reincarnating ego enters to begin his work.

The rest of the question may be answered by some passages from *The Secret Doctrine:*

> Between man and the animal—whose Monads (or Jivas) are fundamentally identical—there is the impassable abyss of Mentality and Self-consciousness. What is human mind in its higher aspect, whence comes it, if it is not a portion of the essence—and, in some rare cases of incarnation, the *very essence* of a high Being; one from a higher and divine plane? Can man—a god in the animal form—be the product of Material Nature by evolution alone, even as is the animal, which differs from man in external shape, but by no means in the materials of its physical fabric, and is informed by the same, though undeveloped, Monad—seeing that the intellectual potentialities of the two differ as the Sun does from the Glow-worm? And what is it that creates such difference, unless man is an animal *plus a living god* within his physical shell? (II, 81.)
>
> No sooner had the mental eye of man been opened to understanding, than the Third Race felt itself one with the ever-present as the ever to be unknown and invisible ALL, the One Universal Deity. Endowed with divine powers, and feeling in himself his *inner* God, each felt he was a Man-God in his nature, though an animal in his physical Self. The struggle between the two began from the very day they tasted of the fruit of the Tree of Wisdom; a struggle for life between the spiritual and the psychic, the psychic and the physical.
>
> Those who conquered the lower principles by obtaining mastery over the body, joined the "Sons of Light." Those who fell victims to their lower natures, became the slaves of Matter. From "Sons of Light and Wisdom" they ended by becoming the "Sons of Darkness." They had fallen in the battle of mortal life with Life immortal, and all those so fallen became the seed of the future generations of Atlanteans (II, 272).
>
> The Lemure-Atlantean had no need of discovering and fixing in his memory that which his informing PRINCIPLE *knew* at the moment of its incarnation. Time alone, and the every-growing obtuseness of the matter in which the *Principles* had clothed themselves, could, the one, weaken the memory of their pre-natal knowledge, the other, blunt and even extinguish every spark of the spiritual and divine in them (II, 285).
>
> . . . pure spirit becomes intoxicated as soon as it is finally imprisoned in matter (II, 145).

> It is a strange law of Nature that, on this plane, the higher (Spiritual) Nature should be, so to say, in bondage to the lower. Unless the Ego takes refuge in the Atman, the ALL-SPIRIT, and merges entirely into the essence thereof, the personal Ego may goad it to the bitter end. This cannot be thoroughly understood unless the student makes himself familiar with the mystery of evolution, which proceeds on triple lines—spiritual, psychic and physical (II, 109).

*If Karma "governs men, animals, worlds, and periods of evolution"* (Ocean, p. 94), *how is it that some classes of savages escape this rule and are only now beginning to spin out Karma* (*S. D.* II, 167-8)?

(*a*) Karma governs the lower kingdoms through the law of physical and psychic action and reaction; this includes the relation of species to environment, involving stimulus and response.

In reference to those men who "are only now beginning to spin out Karma," it would seem that in the case of a true savage, the soul is "young"; that in them self-consciousness is newly awakened and just beginning to make individual choices.

When this happens, Karma takes a new phase in its operations; now the race deliberately chooses either the bad or the good. Then *moral* Karma is "spun out"—individual Karma added to the "class" Karma, the latter having been accumulated through the thousands of years during the "embryonic" development of race before Manas was lighted up.

(*b*) There are different kinds of Karma—physical Karma, mental Karma, race Karma, and many other classes. In *The Secret Doctrine* passage cited, H. P. B. is discussing the development of the intellect in humanity and the reasoning power on this plane. It seems clear, therefore, that when she says that one part of the race was only beginning to spin out Karma, she cannot be referring to spiritual, psychic, or physical Karma, but rather to the *individual* Karma of intellect, of mind and moral responsibility during this cycle. (See *S. D.* II, 302 fn.) The questioner might be helped by considering that whenever one finds statements that seem to contradict each other, it is a good time to stop and work hard over those statements, collecting all the references he can find on the subject. Following are a few that relate to this question: *Ocean,* 53-4; *Answers to Questions,* 90-1, 137-8, 180; *Friendly Philosopher,* 385; *Transactions,* 65-6; THEOSOPHY XIV, 488-9; *S. D.* I, 230, 244-5, 265, 275, 277, 309; II, 1, 78-81, 95, 103, 212, 249, 272, 318 fn., 421 fn.

# MAZZINI — PATRIOT AND THEOSOPHIST

JOSEPH MAZZINI devoted his whole life to the struggle for Italian freedom and national unity. He failed in his attempt to establish the republic for which he labored through half a century, yet his influence, in terms of a spiritual conception of human social development, of duty and mutual responsibility, lives on in the thought of all those who drink at the fountain of his inspiration. This moral energy, blending with the force of other great men of like mind and ideal, must one day bring to realization somewhere in the world that Republic of Brotherhood envisioned by Theosophists.

Born in a liberal Genoese family in 1805, Mazzini came of age at a time when all Europe was in the grip of monarchical reaction. He was ten years old when the Congress of Vienna sought to restore as much as possible of the old order which existed before the French Revolution. The victors of Waterloo regarded democracy, in Metternich's phrase, as an instrument of disorder which could not fail to "change daylight into darkest night." Instituting a system of repression which ignored the rising nationalism of the epoch, they treated the various nations as merely the personal property of their hereditary rulers.

Mazzini was destined early in life to throw off both the traditional European orthodoxies—Romanism in religion and absolutism in government. He refused to go to confession as soon as he understood its meaning, and at the University he would not attend religious services simply because they were compulsory. Well acquainted with the Gospels, he soon saw the betrayal of Christ's teaching by the Roman Church and recognized the necessity for far-reaching religious reforms. The republic of his dreams he regarded as the means to a greater end—fulfillment of the moral mission of humanity. Italy, he hoped, would assume the leadership of European nations in emancipation and unification of the world. The French Revolution had proclaimed the liberty, equality, and fraternity of individual men; it was now the duty of the republican revolution to achieve the liberty, equality, and fraternity of nations.

The rigid censorship of the period could not prevent Mazzini from gaining a true conception of social ideals. A lover of great literature, he spent his childhood absorbing the classics of antiquity. From his studies of ancient Rome, he "came to regard republics as the appointed homes of virtue." When, in 1820 and 1821, after the Carbonaro revolutions had failed, he saw crowds of defeated

Piedmontese liberals passing through Genoa on their way to escape to Spain, this love of liberty became a fire that drove him into the sphere of action. From that time his life belonged to the cause of Italian freedom.

A passionate rebel against the injustices of the *status quo,* Mazzini was nevertheless no ordinary revolutionary. He was rather a consecrated idealist to whom the incessant compromises of political action were a source of moral agony. In each sequence of the protracted struggle to unify the Italian people under a common government, he sought to embody his own high purposes. Yet everywhere he met frustration. The wonder is not that the republic was a failure, but that he was at all successful in communicating his enthusiasm for true freedom to others. In the end, he felt that the new Italy had found its inspiration, "not in Dante but in Macchiavelli." In 1870, after Italy was united under Victor Emmanuel, Mazzini wrote to a friend, "I want to see, before dying, another Italy, the ideal of my soul and life, start up from her three hundred years' grave; this is only the phantom, the mockery of Italy. And the thought haunts me like the incomplete man in Frankenstein, seeking for a soul from its maker." Two years later, he died.

In striking contrast to dominant revolutionary themes of the early nineteenth century, Mazzini's social philosophy was founded on the spiritual ideas of Herder and Lessing. His conception of law grew from a study of Vico, the "father" of the philosophy of history, in whom Mazzini saw a continuation of Pythagorean tradition. Bruno was another of his teachers. At about twenty-three he joined the secret revolutionary Society of the Carbonari, among whom, it was remarked by H. P. Blavatsky, "there was more than one *Freemason* deeply versed in occult sciences and Rosicrucianism." Such was the intellectual and moral environment of the young Mazzini.

With Vico, he held that conscience is the source of the highest law, for which men must search their own hearts. The truth, he urged, will be discovered in "tradition and conscience," which, in action, become "experience and intuition." The knowledge of the past should never be neglected, nor intuition go untested by experience. The seeker must look to "the tradition not of one school or one religion or one age, but of all the schools and all the religions and all the ages in their succession." Truth will most surely be found in "the severe study of the universal tradition, which is life's manifestation in humanity."

In modern histories, the name of Mazzini is always linked with those of Garibaldi and Cavour. Mazzini is called the prophet, Cavour the brain, and Garibaldi the sword of Italian freedom and

unification. Yet the immediate outcome of Mazzini's efforts in terms of political effects should be clearly distinguished from the great social objectives which he proposed and fought for. His writings contain as clear a statement of the Theosophic ideal of human society as can be found in any of the works of those actively engaged in political reform. Mazzini was the great political genius of the nineteenth century—great because he transcended the *merely* political and abhorred all diplomatic opportunism. High above the bickerings and short-sighted compromises of the revolutionary conflict rang his cries, ever for a return to principle, ever repeating his dream of the "new order of ages" to come. If Mazzini erred, it was in an unbounded confidence in his fellow human beings, a too generous estimate of their willingness to sacrifice for an ideal. "Practical" men have called him a dreamer who let reality pass by. In some measure, this may be so. But there was one reality, too often forgotten by other men, that he never overlooked. This was Duty. Between prudence and duty, he always chose the latter. His motto was "Stiffness in principles, tolerance to individuals." He delighted in repeating the words of George Sand, "There is but one virtue, the eternal sacrifice of self."[1]

The problem confronting Mazzini, as revealed in his essays, may be best understood by regarding the revolutionary theories carried over from the eighteenth century. These are most typically represented by the teachings of Jean Jacques Rousseau, who was, almost literally, both the ideological "executioner" of the medieval order of society and the creator of the modern theory of government. As W. V. Byars, an American journalist, has pointed out, Rousseau not only dominated the politics of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but, at the opening of the twentieth century, he still remained "the governing impulse in all that is most distinctively modern in the training of youth for citizenship." Vastly influential on the continent, he also inspired the founders of public education in America. "It is hard to find in history anyone who by purely intellectual force, has exerted a power over the course of events which can be compared to that attributable with certainty to Rousseau."

Unfortunately, the use made of the "intellectual" legacy of Rousseau to the modern world has been accompanied by an imitation of certain of his less admirable qualities. The social life of the present combines brilliant intellectual achievement with vicious moral disorder—a mixture which, in both quality and proportion, had curious karmic anticipation in the French reformer. "The highest benevolence

[1] The facts of Mazzini's life are drawn from Bolton King's biography (Everyman's Library).

seemed not incompatible in him with moral weakness verging close on depravity, — as when, while writing on Virtue and Philosophy, he sent his own children one after another to the foundling asylum." Mr. Byars wonders if Rousseau might not have accomplished far greater results, had he written in the spirit which comes only of a virtuous life. Would the course of subsequent history have been different if Rousseau had influenced his followers to trust the power of demonstrated truth, rather than sudden and violent triumph?

There is no greater social issue to be determined by the serious men of the present than the general problem suggested by this question. The fate of a civilization may lie in the conclusion that is reached.

Except for modern technological achievement, there are many analogies between the time of Rousseau and our own. Just as, then, the injustice of the feudal order had been exposed in all its hideousness, leading to an era of destruction, so, today, the economic materialism which throttled the social ideals of the eighteenth century reformers has found its blind avengers and hating destroyers. And between the solution of the followers of Rousseau, put into effect with the logic of the guillotine, and the more recent revolutions that have swept Europe and Asia, there is little to choose.[2]

Rousseau's greatest mistake, examined at length in Mazzini's essay "On the French Revolution," was in his *artificial* conception of the principle of Popular Sovereignty, of which the latter wrote: "A true principle if considered as the best method of interpreting a supreme moral law which a nation has accepted as its guide, which is solemnly declared in its contract and transmitted by national education; but a false and anarchical principle if proclaimed in the name of force, or in the name of a convention, and abandoned to the caprice of majorities, uneducated, and corrupted by a false conception of life." In another essay, "Faith and the Future," Mazzini developed this criticism:

> The word democracy, although it expresses energetically and with historical precision the secret of the ancient world, is—like all the political phrases of antiquity—below the conception of the future Epoch which we republicans are bound to initiate. The expression *Social Government* would be preferable as indicative of the idea of association, which is the life of the Epoch. The word democracy was inspired by an idea of rebellion, sacred at the time, but still rebellion. Now every such idea is imperfect, and inferior to the idea of unity

[2] For a careful study of the ten great revolutions in European history—of what they accomplished and what they destroyed—the reader should consult Everett Dean Martin's *Farewell to Revolution.*

> which will be the dogma of the future. Democracy is suggestive of struggle; it is the cry of Spartacus, the expression and manifestation of a people in its first arising. Government—the social institution—represents a people triumphant; a people that constitutes itself. The gradual extinction of aristocracy will cancel the word democracy.

In this passage on Democracy, Mazzini voiced the practical foresight of the Founders of the American Republic and anticipated by a century the social history recently recorded by Ortega y Gasset in his *Revolt of the Masses*. His social wisdom is today confirmed by such men as John Dewey, Robert M. Hutchins, Arthur E. Morgan, Will Durant, Alexis Carrel, and many others. These men, all of whom have brooded long over modern social problems, are proclaiming in various ways the essential truth that freedom, undisciplined by responsibility, unguided by a sense of duty, is not the principle of just government but the path to anarchy. This is the critical thesis of Mazzini, now validated by "*brute* fact" in the terrible backlash and undertow of what has been called the "Wave of the Future." The recent revolutions abroad are both judgment and summation of the moral weaknesses of the past. They demonstrate with finality the social failure of the single ideal of "individual right."

The following passages from Mazzini's commentary on Rousseau's doctrine conclude with a clear affirmation of Theosophical principles:

> For Rousseau, the popular sovereignty remained . . . uncertain, ineffective, shifting. He, too [like Voltaire and Montesquieu], had no conception of the collective life of humanity, of its tradition, of the law of progress appointed for the generations, of a common end towards which we ought to strive, of association that can alone attain it step by step. Starting from the philosophy of the *ego* and of individual liberty, he robbed that principle of fruit by basing it, not on a duty common to all, not on a definition of man as an essentially social creature, . . . not on the bond that unites the individual to humanity of which he is a factor, but on a simple convention, avowed or understood. All Rousseau's teaching proceeds from the assertion "that social right is not derived from nature, but based upon conventions." . . . Rousseau has no other program. . . . Stated in these terms the problem contains neither the elements of normal progress, nor the possibility of solving the social economic question of our time. . . . The Society of Rousseau, like that of Montesquieu, is a mutual insurance society, and nothing more.
>
> That first statement, the key of the whole system, is by now proven to be false, and because false, fatal to the development of the principle of popular sovereignty. It is not by the force of conventions or of aught else, but by a necessity of our nature, that societies are founded and grow. Each of us is a part of humanity, each of us lives its life, each is called upon to live for it, to aid the attainment of

> the end assigned to it, to realize, as far as possible in each one of us, the ideal type, the divine thought that guides it. Law is one and the same for individual and collective life, both of which are the expression of a single universal phenomenon, differently modified by space and time. And life, we know now, is progress. If you throw over moral authority, our natural tendencies, our mission, and substitute the merely human authority of conventions as the source of social development, you risk arresting that development, or subjecting it to arbitrary caprice.

In this closing paragraph of the essay on the French Revolution, three of the four great principles of social reform stated by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Key to Theosophy* are unequivocally present. She wrote: "Let me briefly remind you what these principles are—universal Unity and Causation; Human Solidarity; the Law of Karma; Re-incarnation. These are the four links of the golden chain which should bind humanity into one family, one universal Brotherhood." The last of these principles is clearly expressed in "Faith and the Future." The Italian patriot—or rather, this patriot of all mankind, who *worked* in Italy—gained from the doctrine of Reincarnation an inspiration which goes far in explaining the clarity of his perceptions and the intensity of his arguments. Bolton King, Mazzini's biographer, relates:

> He speaks of memory as the consciousness of the soul's progress up from earlier existences; love would be a mockery, if it did not last beyond the grave; the unity of the race implies a link between the living and the dead; science teaches there is no death but only transformation. He held passionately to his faith in immortality, and he believed that the dear ones he had lost were watching over him and bringing his best aspirations. The individual soul, he thought, progresses through a series of re-incarnations, each leading it to a more perfect development, and the rapidity of the advance depends on its own purifications. And as the individual has his progress through a series of existences, so collective man progresses ever through the human generations.

Mazzini was unsuccessful in the attempt to endow the Italian Revolution with his vision of moral purpose. In "Faith and the Future," he shows that the *real* revolution was failing because it added nothing to the revolutionary objectives of the past. The French Revolution, he said, was born from "a Titanic, limitless belief in human power and human liberty . . . a manifestation eminently religious, . . . the aim it was its mission to achieve, was the idea of *right*. From the theory of *right* it derived its power, its mandate, the legitimacy of its acts. The *declaration of the rights of man* is the supreme and ultimate formula of the French Revolution." Then,

in the moving tones of a prophet, Mazzini called his comrades to account. They had failed because they supposed the establishment of individual rights was enough. They came "to regard as a programme for the future that which was in fact but a grand summing up of the past; a formula expressing the results of the labor and achievements of an entire epoch—to confound two distinct epochs and two distinct syntheses—and to narrow a mission of social renovation to the proportions of deduction and development . . . to believe that mission fulfilled which is but modified and enlarged." Now comes his essential criticism:

> This error has led us to break the unity of the conception precisely where it demanded the widest extension; to mistake the function of the eighteenth century, and to make of a negation the point of departure for the nineteenth. We abandoned the religious idea precisely when it was most urgent to revive and extend it until it should embrace the sum of things destined to be transformed, and unite in one grand social conception the forces that are now isolated and divided.

Mazzini described to his colleagues the needs of the future he hoped to build. The doctrine of Human Rights, he showed, becomes an instrument of selfishness and destruction unless joined with the larger conception of *duty:*

> Right is the faith of the individual. Duty is the common collective faith. Right can but organize resistance: it may destroy, it cannot found. Duty builds up, associates, and unites; it is derived from a general law, whereas Right is derived only from human will. There is nothing therefore to forbid a struggle against Right: any individual may rebel against any right in another which is injurious to him; and the sole judge left between the adversaries is Force; and such, in fact, has frequently been the answer which societies based upon right have given their opponents. . . .
>
> Is this all we seek? Ought man, gifted with progressive activity, to remain quiescent like an emancipated slave, satisfied with his solitary liberty? Does naught remain in fulfillment of his mission on earth, but a work of consequences and deductions to be translated into the sphere of fact; or conquests to be watched over and defended? Because man, consecrated by the power of thought, king of the earth, has burst the bonds of a worn-out religious form that imprisoned and restrained his activity and independence, are we to have no new bond of universal fraternity? no religion? no recognized and accepted conception of a general and providential law?[8]

---

[8] He had previously written: "What is the law? I know it not: its discovery is the aim of the actual epoch; but the certainty that such a law exists is sufficient to necessitate the substitution of the idea of Duty for the idea of Right."

Mazzini replied to these momentous queries with a statement of his religious philosophy of social evolution. Addressed to the Deity, it is important to realize that his "God" is incarnate in *Humanity*. Mankind, he held, is the "living word of God," the collective and continuous being," and "the only interpreter of God's law." Thus:

> No. . . . Our Mission is not concluded. As yet we scarcely know its origin, we know not its ultimate aim. Time and discovery do but enlarge its boundaries. It is elevated from age to age towards destinies unknown to us, seeking the law of which as yet we know the first lines. From initiation to initiation, throughout the series of thy successive incarnations, this mission has purified and enlarged the formula of sacrifice; it learns the path it has to follow by the study of an eternally progressive faith. Forms are modified and dissolved—religious beliefs are exhausted. The human spirit leaves them behind as the traveller leaves behind the fires that warmed him through the night, and seeks another scene. But religion remains: the idea is immortal, survives the dead forms, and is reborn from its own ashes. . . .

And to the patriots of that day:

> Such is the law. One labor succeeds another; one synthesis succeeds another. . . . The progressive evolution of the thought of God, of which our world is the visible manifestation, is unceasingly continuous. The chain cannot be broken or interrupted. The various aims are united together—the cradle is linked to the tomb.
>
> . . . when your acts shall correspond to your words, and virtue shall sanctify your life, as liberty has sanctified your intelligence; when united, brothers and believers, and rallied round one sole banner, you appear before mankind as seekers after Good, and they say of you amongst themselves: *These men are a living religion*—think you your appeal to the peoples will not meet with a ready response?

Mazzini lived and wrote, not simply for a generation of Italians, who failed to listen, but for the Ages.

---

## FROM LE LOTUS

Happiness cannot exist where Truth is absent. When built on the quicksands of fictions and human hypotheses, happiness is only a house of cards falling at the first breath; it cannot really exist so long as Egoism reigns supreme in civilized societies. There is never but one means of improving human life: it is the love of your neighbor for himself and not for your personal gratification. —H. P. B.

# ON THE LOOKOUT

## "An Indian's Soliloquy"

In his *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita,* W. Q. Judge writes of the "inherent ideas" which are the birthright of every human being, preserved, for the most part, "by the uneducated masses, who, having no scholastic theories to divert their minds, keep up what is left of the succession of ideas." The sanctity of the family, the Deity resident in Nature, reverence for parents, and respect for tradition—these conceptions are part of the wisdom transmitted by the Divine Teachers to primitive mankind—truths scoffed at and neglected almost entirely by the prophets of the modern age. Now, in the "winter of our discontent," such simple verities stand in bright contrast to the facile formulas of materialism. Even scientists are turning to the cultural remnants of other days to find fragmentary evidence of a better way of life. Writing in the *American Journal of Sociology* for last July, B. W. Aginsky reported without comment the observations of a centenarian Pomo Indian of northern California—one who "had lived through a period which encompassed the days before any whites had come into his territory, the Spanish raids, the white massacres, the herding of his people upon reservations, and the variegated civilized tortures accompanying these deprivations." This is what he told the sociologist:

> "What is a man? A man is nothing. Without his family he is of less importance than a bug crossing the trail. . . . The family is important. If a man has a large family and a profession and upbringing by a family that is known to produce good children, then he is somebody and every family is willing to have him marry a woman of their group. It is the family that is important. In the white ways of doing things the family is not so important. The police and soldiers take care of you, the courts give you justice, the post office carries messages for you, the school teaches you. Everything is taken care of, even your children, if you die; but with us the family must do all of that.

## They "Got Along Better"

> "Without the family we are nothing, and in the old days before the white people came the family was given the first consideration by anyone who was about to do anything at all. That is why we got along. We had no courts, judges, schools, and the other things you have, but we got along better than you. We had poison [sorcery—black magic], but if we minded our own business and restrained our-

selves we lived well. We were taught to leave people alone. We were taught to consider that other people had to live. We were taught that we could suffer from the devil, spirits, ghosts, or other people if we did not support one another. The family was everything, and no man ever forgot that. Each person was nothing, but as a group joined by blood the individual knew that he could get the support of all his relatives if anything happened. He also knew that if he was a bad person the head man of his family would pay another tribe to kill him so that there would be no trouble afterward and so that he would not get the family into trouble all of the time.

## "YOUR OLD PEOPLE MUST BE FOOLS"

"That is why we were good people and why we were friends with the white people when they came. But the white people were different from us. They wanted to take the world for themselves. My grandfather told me that the white people were homeless and had no families. They came by themselves and settled on our property. They had no manners. They did not know how to get along with other people. They were strangers who were rough and common and did not know how to behave. But I have seen that these people of yours are even worse. They have taken everything away from the Indians, and they take everything away from one another. They do not help one another when they are in trouble, and they do not care what happens to other people. We were not like that. We would not let a person die of starvation when we had plenty of food. We would not bury our dead with no shawl. We would kill another person by poisoning him if he was an enemy, but we would not treat a stranger the way they treat their own brothers and sisters. Your people are hard to understand. My brother lived with your people for twenty years, and he said that he was used to you; but he cannot understand yet why you people act as you do. You are all the same in one way. We are all the same in another. What is wrong with you? The white people have the land. They own the courts, they own everything, but they will not give the Indians enough money to live on. It is hard to understand.

"With us the family was everything. Now it is nothing. We are getting like the white people, and it is bad for the old people. We had no old peoples' homes like you. The old people were important. They were wise. Your old people must be fools."

## "SELF-DISCIPLINE OR SLAVERY"

To this day, the American Indians practice sorcery; they have their "poison" and their simple solution of destroying the "bad" man. The Indians are in their stone age—last sequence of cultural decline in the cyclic course of race evolution—yet they possess a tradition of

human relations from which their white brothers have much to learn. Is there any essential difference between this tribal homily and the more polished dissertation of the modern philosopher, Will Durant? Proposing the alternatives of "Self-discipline or Slavery" for the American people to choose between, Mr. Durant wrote in the *Saturday Evening Post* of Jan. 18:

> Our enemies are not abroad, nor are they aliens among us; they are our own pettiness and laxity of means, our soft indulgence, immature emotionalism, and wishful thinking; they are the hyphens that nearly all of us harbor in our souls, making us think of our European background and heritage rather than of our American obligations and destiny. It is ourselves whom we must overcome. If we can discipline ourselves we shall be free.

## "Goodby To All That"

> Let us begin at the beginning and proclaim, with all the humility of a repentant prodigal, the return of discipline to our homes. Libertarian education was a mistake, a pleasant indulgence of parental love, a weak inability on our own part to command because we had never learned to obey. The result is an adolescence without responsibility, a maturity without character; and the maturity of our children will not thank us for the liberty of their youth. To exact nothing of a child that its intellect cannot understand and approve is the depth of nonsense to which some of us dedicated ourselves in the days of our dreams. Parents must learn again to command, to assign duties and to see to it that they are performed; they must not be ashamed to require—and must fit themselves to deserve—filial respect, quiet obedience, and such courtesy as may comport with the vigor and exhilaration of growth. . . .

## Duty and Responsibility

> A sterner education must come. First, of the body in health and strength. The health of nations is more important than the wealth of nations, for no amount of money can long make a sickly man happy, and no amount of misfortune can long make a healthy man miserable. Second, of the hands. We should learn, in school and college, to do things as well as to read and memorize and talk; the girl should learn how to cook without killing, how to care for a home, a husband and a child; and the boy should acquire some mechanic trade that will give an economic footing to his personality. Third, of the intellect—but of this kind of education we have more than our society can digest. Fourth—second in importance only to health—education of the soul. An ounce of character is worth a ton of intellect. As much time should be given to moral education and discipline in

> school and college as to any subject in the curriculum. The experience of English schools proves that discipline is not the enemy but the soundest basis and defence of individual and national freedom. Teachers should not hesitate to instill in their pupils the old virtues of duty and modesty; the age of Ibsen is over, and Freud is dead.

Mr. Durant revolts against our modern "cosmetic culture." He returns to tradition, a wiser and a sadder man. If he places health before ethics, and would exact of children an almost military obedience, at the expense of the development of understanding, it is because he writes in reaction to our sins of indulgence. He freely admits his own "progressivist" excesses and it would be unfair to cavil at certain obvious imperfections in this frank confession of modern social life. There are too many major truths in what he says. "Self-discipline or Slavery" is an article appropriate to the needs and understanding of the race-mind of this epoch, and will offend nobody except die-hard extremists. The tragedy lies in the fact that the Pomo Indians *lived* their credo, while the modern world, populated chiefly by "false pietists of bewildered soul," will probably admire Mr. Durant's fine words, approve most heartily his "constructive" ideas, yet seldom think of applying them. But there are bound to be some exceptions. With these few men of character and determination lies the hope of the future.

## THE GENTLE PARAMECIUM

The rigid separation of mind and matter—a dogma of science since the time of Descartes—suffers some serious denials at the hands of the eminent biologist, Prof. H. S. Jennings, of the University of California at Los Angeles. Starting with the principle that social behavior is an objective correlate of self-consciousness, he examines in detail the habits of the species of infusoria, *Paramecium bursaria,* noting in particular their habits of mating. Finding many evidences of what he calls "social relations," Prof. Jennings observes:

> It is a curious fact that although the spectacular clumping in great masses . . . was only recently discovered in these animals, this gentle behavior—courtship or flirting as it might be called—was seen long ago in some of the infusoria. The older microscopists of fifty years ago were a good deal excited about it and its possible psychological implications. . . . Some of the authors described such behavior and its possible psychological bearing with enthusiasm and exuberance. But zoologists of late have been disposed to frown upon it, to hush it up, pass over it unmentioned. For it is not the sort of behavior that lends itself most readily to formulation in the simple terms that are dear to the hearts of mechanistic biologists—particu-

larly in relation to single cells. Yet this is behavior that does occur in unicellular animals, that is widespread among them, and in relation to the unity of life phenomena among organisms appears of great significance (*Science,* Dec. 13, 1940).

## "Awareness" Among Animals

Admitting that all the "manifold social discriminations, attractions and repulsions have in the infusoria chemical or physical correlates," he points out that this is true also of man, whom, nevertheless, we describe as a conscious being. And it is evident, he says, "that some of the behavior of these simpler organisms much resembles that which in ourselves has subjective accompaniments, has even conscious awareness of relations." Prof. Jennings indicates that because the infusorian is unable to experience within itself *all* the "components and relations" of the social system of which it is a unit, this tiny animal cannot possibly have *conscious awareness* of that system in any reflective sense, yet urges that in the type of social behavior exhibited by the *Paramecium* both "social consciousness and self-consciousness have their roots." The sense of social dominance manifested by some members in species of higher animals, and the sense of subordination shown by other members of the same species—pecked hens to the "peckers," for instance—are cited by the biologist as evidence of social awareness; therefore, of a kind of self-consciousness.

> Such demands for precedence, such recognition of one's self as a subordinate, or as occupying a clearly defined place in the social hierarchy, seem clearly to involve a consciousness of the self as an individual among others; or at least they involve the objective correlate of self-consciousness. Unless we arbitrarily deny all consciousness to other organisms than men, we can not consistently deny to them self-consciousness: that is, awareness of the self as an individual among individuals. The attempts to reserve self-consciousness as a distinctive attribute of man therefore appear to be outmoded; they appear out of touch with scientific knowledge.

## Man and Animal

Before examining Prof. Jennings' reduction of self-consciousness to a high degree of animal behavior, let us approve strongly his general thesis. He contends for the view presented by H. P. B. in "Kosmic Mind," an article largely devoted to showing that the behavior of micro-organisms is a form of *intelligent* action. In identifying the mental activity of animals and man, Prof. Jennings fails to distinguish between what H. P. B. elsewhere calls "Psychic and Noëtic Action." The consciousness of all classes of animal intelligence

up to man is simply *psychic*. A recent communication to the American *Journal of Philosophy* (July 18, 1940) will serve as commentary on Prof. Jennings' over-simplification. The writer, Folke Leander, observes:

> When looking at a young dog, you certainly perceive something more than inert matter. There is . . . an expressional quality; you are aware of a living being. There is an *organic quality* characterizing this piece of matter. And it is perceived . . . as a principle of spontaneity, vitality, creativity. The actions of the organism are felt to express a vital dynamism, to be inspired by a living soul. Similarly, passing from animal to human life, we perceive a new type of qualities. We recognize actions as belonging to the human type by the fact that they have meaning, intent, purpose, *i. e.,* by the fact that they are preceded by and take place under the control of symbolic activities and have thus "directed quality." Look at any human around you: you perceive that his actions mean something, that they have mental quality, that they express not only life but also mind. Here again I do not see how anyone could possibly deny that these qualities are perceived as actively inspiring behavior. . . .

## Distinctive Qualities

> Either there is intent, meaning, purpose, or there is not—nothing intermediary is conceivable. The "emergence" of meaningful behavior is indeed, in Dewey's phrase, a wonder. Unless you deny there *are* organic qualities in nature, you will have to maintain that physico-chemical causality has been transcended. Manifestly, a recognition that they do not exist in nature, would be synonymous to no longer perceiving them there. . . . The same hold true of mental qualities: either they are what they seem, or they are not at all in nature. The only way to avoid self-contradiction is to take at its face value our immediate sense of activity, of freedom, of spontaneity and creativity. Since we do discriminate between a bodily and a conscious aspect of our own activities and those of others, and since the sense of initiative, of activity, is more closely connected with the conscious aspect, we can not but attribute a "leading" function to the latter.

## Human Powers Unique

Mr. Leander speaks for science, philosophy, and common sense. The human mind comprehends by symbolic activities, it conceives and manipulates abstractions, and the human soul is capable of moral purpose, of *impersonal* altruism and self-sacrifice—all qualities which are utterly lacking in "objective correlates" among the species of the lower kingdoms. The mental phenomena of the animal kingdom are

not studied by scientists with the same type of intellectual perception that is there manifested; human thought is another order of thinking than animal cognition, and no amount of "evidence" can ever prove the contrary. However, as H. P. B. wrote in *The Secret Doctrine*, Theosophists can hope for no sudden conversion of the biological fraternity. "Materialism and scepticism are evils that must remain in the world as long as man has not quitted his present gross form to don the one he had during the first and second races of this Round." (I, 480.) The time of that refinement, and the qualifications thereto, are suggestively indicated in the second volume, on pages 300 and 301.

## "Return To Religion"

A thoughtful article in the *Atlantic* for November, 1940, considers the problem confronting many intelligent persons—professional people such as journalists, lawyers, doctors, economists—"who have of late become, or are fast becoming, reinterested in religion, and that in no merely casual or academic fashion." The writer is Bernard Iddings Bell, identified by the editors as "a clergyman and educator who has exerted a persuasive influence upon those men and women who have felt the need—and the attending embarrassment—of returning to the Church after many years of separation." Mr. Bell is therefore well qualified to give the reasons which are causing this return. There are, in his judgment, four fundamental reasons:

> (1) First, there are those who seek to escape lack of a sense of meaning, such as commonly results from too close an absorption in scientific pursuits. The agnosticism which prevails today is not the facile sort of skepticism common at the turn of the century. The newer agnosticism suspects that man is unable of himself to discover anything about purpose, the purpose of the universe or the purpose of himself within that universe. . . . The realization of this inadequacy in modern man's approach to knowledge is devastating to many thoughtful people. . . . They will not, they find they cannot, abdicate from a humanity the sole distinguishing feature of which is the search to know the reason for things.

## Surfeit of "Things"

> (2) Secondly, there are those who return to religion to escape the pressure of possessions. . . . Most people seem fairly content . . . to restrict activity and to accept as adequate measure for a satisfactory standard of living a large number of gadgets and a certain amount of amusement, chiefly mechanical. In this they are encouraged by a continuous barrage of meretricious advertising. But strange as it

may seem to the multitude, there are those whose dearest wish it is to break away from servitude to all this smothering plenty and to come at spiritual independence.

## QUEST FOR SALVATION

(3) Thirdly, there are those who resume the practice of religion in a revolt against the tyranny of force. Man left to himself, these perceive, is not only a greedy beast, but cruel. In constant quest of wealth, and with an unquenchable lust to dominate, more and more he throws off the mask of benevolence, discards even lip service to an honorable fraternity, and makes a frank appeal to arms. . . . A world thus occupied by ravening wolves, some attacking in packs and the rest defending in packs, the tools of competition only refinements of tooth and claw, seems to many a man of sensitivity, a world so chaotic as to imperil sanity. It may be that such a man can see no way to extricate himself from complicity in carnage. He may grimly acquiesce. Or it may be that he accepts the horrors of his time as penalty for a human sin in the guilt for which he is himself involved. But such a tragic turmoil surely cannot be the rightful end of man. Wherein lies salvation from this madness—salvation for himself, for his children, for humanity as a whole?

(4) A fourth impetus to renewed religion is a desire thereby to escape the pressure of self-consciousness. There can be little doubt in the mind of any candid observer of contemporary life and thought that most of the impulsions today tend to produce in man an introspection dangerous to psychic health. Constantly one is being urged to remember himself, to improve himself, to express himself—all these in terms of here and now. . . . The person of intelligence, like everyone else, feels the supposed necessity; and yet at the same time, because he is no fool, he is apt to realize quite clearly that, in terms of here and now, this self-expression is a futile folly, that all earthly careers are of necessity frustrated careers, that death destroys accomplishment and buries each man's mundane fame in swift oblivion. . . . There comes only too often, from realization of this dilemma, a morbid resentment, a constant irritation, even a fundamental despair; but there may result instead, and frequently does result, a search for some great cause in service of which one may lose one's self.

## NEED FOR PHILOSOPHY

These are the reasons why modern men are turning to religion; they "revolt against an unhealthy domination of this transient world" and hope in Christianity to find meaning for their wasting lives, an ideal to serve, and freedom from the bonds of "things." To all these men and women of intelligence, the Church holds up its one possession of value—the glorious example of the Prophet of Nazareth.

This will be enough for some, but for only a few. The image of one great soul may enthral the devotional instinct of the human heart, but there is no philosophy in images. The mystery of good and evil still remains to taunt the mind of the would-be believer in Christian ethics. And if he asks what death may hold, he is crowded around with mystery. He dare not ponder the great questions of life, for should he find the answers, they would not be "Christian."

The founder of the Christian religion told his disciples, "He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." If the Churches would find the life that was Christ's, they will have to die as organizations, to enter once more the womb of the One Truth and be born again. The old body of dogma can not be animated again by the "blood of the Lamb." The time is past when a child's tale of sulphurous fires and pearly gates will satisfy one who wants to know the destiny of the soul after death. Modern man demands philosophy, and Christianity has none to offer.

## Life on Other Worlds

Speculation about the presence of life on other planets has been a popular scientific pastime for centuries—ever since astronomy was divorced from its occult aspect of astrology and became one of the modern or purely physical and mathematical sciences. The New York *Times* of Oct. 27, 1940, provides an account of the theory of Spencer Jones, royal astronomer of Great Britain, who says:

> The most recent physical evidence indicates that in the sun's family physical conditions are such that only Mars and Venus possibly can support life of the same pattern as that on earth and superficially Venus, because of its conditions of temperature and moisture, would seem to be the most favorable.

On the possibility of other stars than the sun having families of planets, he writes:

> If the proportion of planets on which life can exist is not more than one in a million—and our survey of the solar system suggests that this is a considerable underestimate—the total number of planets where conditions are suitable for life must be considerable. So it seems probable that there are other worlds where life exists, though that life may be entirely different from any form with which we are familiar.

## Conditions Needed for "Life"

The greater part of this astronomer's discussion is based upon spectroscopic studies revealing the conditions prevailing on Mars and

Venus with respect to water, vapor, oxygen and carbon dioxide—the elements which science considers essential to life. On this subject, H. P. B. says in *The Secret Doctrine:*

> Examining the astronomical conditions of the other planets, it is easy to show that several are far better adapted for the development of life and intelligence—even under the conditions with which men are acquainted—than is our earth. For instance, on the planet Jupiter the seasons, instead of varying between wide limits as do ours, change by almost imperceptible degrees, and last twelve times as long as ours. Owing to the inclination of its axis the seasons on Jupiter are due almost entirely to the eccentricity of its orbit, and hence change slowly and regularly. We shall be told, that no life is possible on Jupiter, as it is in an incandescent state. But not all astronomers agree with this. . . .
>
> On the other hand Venus would be less adapted for human life such as exists on earth, since its seasons are more extreme and its changes of temperature more sudden; though it is curious that the duration of the *day* is nearly the same on the four inner planets, Mercury, Venus, the Earth and Mars.

MERCURY AND VENUS

> On Mercury, the Sun's heat and light are seven times what they are on Earth, and astronomy teaches that it is enveloped in a very dense atmosphere. And as we see that life appears more active on earth in proportion to the light and heat of the sun, it would seem more than probable that its intensity is far, far greater on Mercury than here.
>
> Venus, like Mercury, has a very dense atmosphere, as also has Mars, and the snows which cover their poles, the clouds which hide their surface, the geographical configuration of their seas and continents, the variations of seasons and climates, are all closely analogous —at least to the eye of the physical astronomer. But such facts and the considerations to which they give rise, have reference only to the possibility of the existence on these planets of human life as known on earth. That some forms of life such as we know are *possible* on these planets, has been long since abundantly demonstrated, and it seems perfectly useless to go into detailed questions of the physiology, etc., etc., of these hypothetical inhabitants, since after all the reader can arrive only at an imaginary extension of his familiar surroundings (II, 706-7).

In these passages, one finds the serious attention always given by H. P. Blavatsky to the current theories of physical science, showing that justice and impartiality can neglect no phase of honest investigation. The point of her discussion, however, lies in the criticism of the scientific assumption that conditions which support life on earth

must be similar or identical on other planets, if life is conceded to exist there. This point is implicitly acknowledged by Dr. Jones when he admits the probability that life on other worlds is "entirely different from any form with which we are familiar." This view will become more acceptable as the scientific distinction between "living" and "dead" matter is cast aside by astronomers, following the lead of modern biology, and as "life" is recognized as being present wherever there are manifestations of light, matter and energy.

### Venus and Earth

To the concept that life, light, and energy or electricity are *one,* Theosophy adds that all life is *intelligent,* and that every motion in space may be traced to a prior motion of idea, however remote this cause may be from its ultimate effect. From the viewpoint of intelligent beings on other planets, as distinguished from the more or less physical considerations reviewed above, *The Secret Doctrine* states:

> *Every world has its parent star and sister planet. Thus Earth is the adopted child and younger brother of Venus, but its inhabitants are of their own kind. . . . All sentient complete beings* (full septenary men or higher beings) *are furnished, in their beginnings, with forms and organisms in full harmony with the nature and state of the sphere they inhabit* (II, 33).

### Bright Lucifer

"Venus," Dr. Jones thinks, "represents the world's past. Conditions there are somewhat similar to those the earth passed through nearly a billion years ago." This seems like a reversed intuition of the connection between the two planets. "Venus," according to *The Secret Doctrine,* is the most occult, powerful, and mysterious of all the planets; the one whose influence upon, and relation to the Earth is most prominent." (*S. D.* II, 30.) H. P. B. named the magazine which she founded and edited in Europe, *Lucifer,* which is another name for Venus, and in her article, "The History of a Planet," which appeared in the first issue, she said:

> No star, among the countless myriads that twinkle over the sidereal fields of the night sky, shines so dazzlingly as the planet Venus—not even Sirius—Sothis, the dog-star, beloved by Isis. Venus is the queen among our planets, the crown jewel of our solar system. She is the inspirer of the poet, the guardian and companion of the lonely shepherd, the lovely morning and the evening star. For, "Stars teach us as well as shine," although their secrets are still untold and unrevealed to the majority of men, including astronomers.

## GHOSTLY LORELEI

A strange "ghost story" which first appeared in the London *Courier* is reprinted in the March *Magazine Digest*. Late in the summer of 1898, an officer in the Czar's artillery slipped away for a dip in a cool river after wearying maneuvers in South Russia. Following his swim he fell asleep on the bank, but was suddenly awakened by a voice calling his name. He discerned the features and form of a beautiful woman who came towards him out of the water, inviting him to swim with her. For some reason unknown to himself he refused her repeated invitation. She returned to the center of the river where she seemed to be caught by a strong undercurrent which drew her under the surface. The officer swam to the rescue, but arrived too late and barely escaped himself from the hidden vortex of water. Returning to the bank, he ran for help, finally coming upon an aged Russian peasant. After telling what had happened, he asked for a boat. The peasant refused.

## A RESTLESS "BHUT"

> "She sank seven years ago," he said. "She lived here. She was not a bad looking girl. She was in love with a corporal in the Infantry. When he had to go away she went crazy. She drowned herself in the river. Well, may she know rest! Since then she has been there always. She is lonely. She wants company, especially men in uniform. Yes, she has drowned six men since she died. Only strangers take notice of her. Any man round here runs when he hears her voice.
>
> "She is one of those things that is walking, but should not be walking,' said the old man. "She should be sleeping, not walking."

Chapter XII of volume I of *Isis Unveiled* affords many instances of similar phenomena. H. P. B. describes the rites performed by Hindus to propitiate the *bhuts* of such *"bad virgins,"* as they are called, continuing with a general discussion of vampirism. (See pp. 446-60.)